

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include corrections of minor informalities. These sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 4, 5A, 6B, 7A, and 8. Specifically, Figures 4, 5A, 6B, and 7A have been corrected to make the margins acceptable with regard to size. Figure 8 has also been corrected to improve the character of lines, numbers, and letters therein. In light of these changes, acceptance of the replacement sheets is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Five (5) Replacement sheets

REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-7 and 9-35 were pending. Claims 13-19, 21-23 and 35 were allowed. Claims 1, 4, 12, 20, 24, 28 and 34 were rejected. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-11, 25-27 and 29-33 were objected to. In this paper, Claims 1, 20, 24, and 34 are amended. Claim 8 has been added. Claims 1-35 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that each of the presently pending claims is in condition for allowance.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With this paper, the word “server” has been amended to recite “service” as suggested in the Office Action. As amended, “service” is accorded sufficient antecedent basis, at least by way of the “intermediate service” further referenced in parent claim, Claim 13. In light of this amendment, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 12, 24, 28 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grantges, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,510,464 (hereafter “Grantges”).

With this paper, Claims 1, 24, and 34 have been amended to include a limitation similar to, albeit different from, that which is included in allowable claims, Claims 13 and 35. For example, Claim 1, as amended, recites:

receiving a request at a predetermined interval after a previous request from a destination computer behind the firewall, the destination computer request demonstrating that the destination computer is available to be accessed;

After carefully reviewing the applied prior art, it is respectfully submitted that Grantges neither teaches nor suggests such a limitation, including when each of the additional limitations of Claim 1 are considered as a whole. Rather, the messages issued from the private network side of the firewall (32) in Grantges are reactive or responsive to other occurrences in the system. For example, message (74) from the server (40) is responsive to the digital certificate in the contents of a received HTTPS message (72) (col. 9, lines 1-20 of Grantges). Also, message (78), comprising an “options page”, is sent “in turn” or after a message (76) is received that comprises cookies (90,92) from client computer (22) (col. 10, lines 23-31). Each of these messages further originates after the receipt of an initial message (64) from the client computer (col. 8, lines 15-28 of Grantges). No particular timing for these messages is specified in Grantges, including that which may be considered a pre-ordained passage of time. The sequence of exchanges, such as illustrated in Figure 2, is disclosed as the underlying root of the operations in the system of Grantges.

In contrast, a request in the claimed invention, as is further represented in amended Claims 1 and 34, is received at a predetermined interval after a previous request. Claim 24 includes a similar, albeit different, limitation, wherein requests are issued by a destination computer to an intermediate service at predetermined intervals. In each of these claims, the timing of the receipt or issue of the requests is neither reactive nor interactive, but rather, pre-established, relative to the timing of the receipt or issue of at least one other request. It is respectfully submitted that such an arrangement for the requests of the destination server, as further represented in these claims, reflects an independence of the destination server from the client computer. Such a separation is neither taught nor suggested for the requests in the teachings of Grantges. For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 24, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested. Further, so far as Claims 4, 12, and 28 depend on these amended claims, withdrawal of the rejections applied thereto is respectfully requested for at least the same reasons presented herein.

With this paper, **Claim 8** has been added to correct a numbering discrepancy present in the previously submitted set of claims. Claim 8 includes a limitation similar, albeit different, from

that discussed herein with regards to Claim 1, as well as allowed Claims 13 and 35. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 8 is not taught or suggested by Grantges for reasons similar to those discussed herein for Claim 1.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13-19, 21-23 and 35 were allowed.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9-11, 25-27 and 29-33 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

So far as these claims depend from amended Claims 1 or 24, and thus incorporate the limitations thereof, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to these claims should be withdrawn because of the amendments made herein to overcome rejections of the parent claims.

Claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action.

With this paper, Claim 20 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 20 is allowable for at least the same reasons as parent Claim 13.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant's representative believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

John W. Branch
Registration No.: 41,633
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(206) 262-8906
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant